DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 442 HE 020 498

AUTHOR	Mortimer, Kenneth P.; And Others
TITLE	Academic Reallocation: A National Profile. A Report from the Project on Reallocation.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY. College Retirement Equities Fund.
PUB DATE	Feb 85
NOTE	41p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 133 Willard Building, University Park, PA 16802 ($5.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; *College Faculty; Employment Practices; Higher Education; *Personnel Policy; *Reduction in Force; *Retraining; *Retrenchment; Teacher Dismissal; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Faculty Reassignment; Project on Reallocation

ABSTRACT

Reallocation and reduction strategies being used by four-year colleges and universities were identified by the Project on Reallocation, which contacted 318 four-year institutions. The strengths and weaknesses of the reallocation and reduction strategies were also assessed. Telephone interviews were conducted with the chief academic officer or a designate concerning faculty personnel, academic budgets, and program policies and practices. Additional information on institutional characteristics were drawn from the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). Site visits and interviews were also conducted at nine institutions. Consideration was given to tenure-related staffing practices and alternatives to tenure-track staffing, faculty retraining for new or revised assignments, and faculty reductions (layoffs, terminations, and resignations when faced with dismissal). The most common reallocation approach appeared to be attrition, whereby institutions captured loose positions and funds as they became available. Another approach used by some institutions was to plan decrements in order to handle decline. These two approaches to reallocation were implemented in either across-the-board or selective fashions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285442

ACADEMIC REALLOCATION: A NATIONAL PROFILE

A Report from

The Project on Reallocation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth C. Mortimer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Pennsylvania State University
325 Pond Lab
University Park, PA 16802

HE 020 498

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACADEMIC REALLOCATION: A NATIONAL PROFILE

A Report from

The Project on Reallocation

by:

Kenneth P. Mortimer
Marque Bagshaw
Annette Caruso

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
325 Pond Laboratory
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

February 1985

INTRODUCTION

Since March 1982, the Project on Reallocation has been seeking answers to three basic questions:

1. What reallocation, reduction, and retrenchment strategies are being used by four-year colleges and universities?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these strategies?
3. How can the implementation of these strategies be improved?

To answer these questions, Project staff (with the support of the Lilly Endowment, Inc., and TIAA/CREF) reviewed published and fugitive literature on academic reallocation, conducted 318 telephone interviews with a random sample of chief academic officers or their designates in four-year colleges and universities, and conducted site visits at nine institutions.

This report first describes the Project and the context of reduction, reallocation, and retrenchment which stimulated it. We then summarize the findings from the survey and discuss the differences for particular institutional types. The site visits and a few additional narratives on campus policymaking form the basis for some concluding observations about four reallocation and reduction strategies and their effectiveness.

The Project

In Spring 1982, we drew a random sample of 369 institutions from a population of 1,371 four-year colleges and universities. (Professional schools and other specialized institutions were excluded.) Telephone interviews were conducted with the chief academic officer or a designate of 318 institutions, an 86 percent response rate. Prior to the interview each respondent received a list of 25 questions about faculty personnel, academic budgets, and program policies and practices. Responses were coded for computerized data analysis together with the following additional information on institutional characteristics drawn from national data sources (such as HEGIS):

-- enrollments in Fall, 1972, 1975, 1976 (respondents provided the comparable 1981 figures)
-- public or private status
-- Carnegie classification
-- collective bargaining status
-- single or multi-campus status
-- location of the campus

The representativeness of the sample was verified by the appropriate statistical tests, and institutional data were analyzed statistically in order to establish .05 level confidence intervals for the observations offered in this report. Because sample institutions represent slightly more than 23 percent of the population of four-year colleges and universities, our estimates from the sample to the national population are the product of multiplying the results by a factor of 4.3. A more technical treatment of data definitions and survey

procedures is available upon request from the Center for the Study of Higher Education.

From February through August 1983, site visits were conducted at nine institutions. The institutions were chosen as examples of the approaches to reallocation and reduction that were identified in the professional literature, rather than for their representativeness in a statistical sense. The typical site visit was conducted after analysis of institutional documents. During the visits, institutional reports and documents were supplemented with from 15 to 25 interviews with administrators and faculty leaders.

Thus, this report includes observations from both the national and the campus-based perspectives. The observations are based on these data, a rather comprehensive literature review, and other studies of institutional adaptations. [See Bagshaw, 1984; Johnson and Mortimer, 1977; Mortimer, 1981; Mortimer, Bagshaw, and Masland (forthcoming); Mortimer and Ladd, 1980; Mortimer and Taylor, 1984; Mortimer and Tierney, 1979].

The Institutional Context

In the 1980s institutions of higher education have faced a situation in which institutional costs continue to grow faster than institutional revenues. The situation derives from a combination of interrelated demographic and economic conditions that have been discussed frequently in the literature (e.g., Carnegie Council, 1980; Mortimer and Tierney, 1979; Stadtman, 1980) and encountered in a variety of institutional settings.

Given some combination of these conditions--which do not affect every institution to the same degree or in the same way--institutions have only a limited number of options: to generate additional revenues; to reduce expenditures; to reallocate resources internally in order to convert revenues more efficiently in producing institutional services; or to seek some combination of the three.

To generate revenues, some institutions have experimented with more aggressive recruitment of both traditional college-age and older clienteles, and some have adopted more flexible admissions policies in order to boost enrollments. Some institutions have added more job-oriented programs to their curriculum and redesigned existing programs to appeal more directly to students (Stadtman, 1980, p. 8). Many institutions have increased tuition, while, in some cases, trying to project the number of students who may choose not to enroll at a given level of tuition increase. Almost every institution has attempted to revitalize or expand its development or private giving program in recent years.

On the other side of the ledger, expenditure-reducing options fall into two categories: those that are directed to curbing the rate of expenditure growth, and those directed to reducing the absolute size of annual budget expenditures. Some institutions have attempted to reduce the growth of non-academic expenditures through greater efficiency in operations, purchasing, and scheduling, and by deferring expenditures like normal maintenance of physical plant and new and replacement equipment purchase. However, maintenance cannot be deferred indefinitely, and deferred equipment purchase in instructional and research areas may jeopardize research efforts and instructional quality.

These savings, while significant, do not alter the fact that faculty and supporting staff salaries and wages normally constitute 70 to 80 percent of an institution's budgetary expenditures (Mortimer and Tierney, 1979, p. 35). Thus, important opportunities for expenditure growth reduction lie in the area of salaries, and these opportunities amount to salary cuts, salary freezes, reduced (or "deferred") salary increments, collapsing vacant positions, alternatives to tenure-track staffing practices, and termination or layoff of personnel.

Because a large proportion of an institution's budget is devoted to academic salaries, efforts to reduce significantly the absolute size of budget expenditures focus on academic areas. Basically, there are two options: to change student/faculty ratios or to change the composition of the faculty so as to lower the total dollar amount of faculty costs. Increasing the number of students while holding the number of faculty constant is essentially a revenue-generating option; holding the number of students constant while decreasing the number of faculty is an expenditure-reducing option which, as suggested by Mortimer and Tierney (1979, p. 35), may have an adverse effect on faculty morale and the quality of student advising and classroom instruction. Nonetheless, reducing the number of faculty and the number of faculty positions, either across the board or as a direct result of specific academic program closures, has become a necessity for many institutions.

Other strategies for changing the composition of faculty take the form of a number of alternative staffing practices, including: use of part-time and non-tenure-track positions, implementation of tenure quotas, tougher enforcement of tenure and promotion criteria (or new, tougher criteria), retraining faculty for reassignment, and providing incentives for early retirement.

Ordinarily, internal reallocation of resources to achieve greater efficiency is conceived in term of funds and faculty positions. However, under-utilized faculty members in low student-demand areas also may be converted to more productive resources through exchange and retraining programs, and by reassigning them to middle-level administrative and managerial positions formerly held by non-teaching professionals (Kanter, 1979). As has been pointed out by the Carnegie Council (1975, p. 87) and by Shapiro (1978, p. 21), internal reallocation of funds is a main source of flexibility for institutions when revenue growth declines, and this is in large part because funds are a liquid resource. Faculty members, however, are a relatively illiquid resource; they cannot be divested or reallocated easily. Tenure commitments add to the difficulty. Based on the results of the Project on Reallocation survey, 94 percent of American four-year colleges and universities have a tenure system, and 57 percent of all full-time faculty have tenure.

Thus, a major problem for institutions seeking to reduce expenditures and to use revenues more efficiently is the problem of how to: (1) limit the growth or reduce the number of tenure commitments, (2) make more flexible staffing arrangments, and (3) reallocate faculty, thereby avoiding payment of an increasing higher price for production resources that because of changes in student demand or because of tenure commitments may not be efficiently employed.

The Project on Reallocation sought to determine how institutions are actually dealing with this problem and whether there is any systematic pattern to their responses. These concerns are reflected in the three questions cited at the beginning of this report and addressed in the following discussion of the Project's findings.

PART I

FINDINGS

In the results reported here, Carnegie classification is treated as a three-category variable, each category corresponding to one of three major categories of the Carnegie Council (1976) classification scheme, namely:

1.0 Doctorate-granting universities: Institutions that have "awarded at least 20 Ph.D.'s in 1973-74 without regard to field, or 10 Ph.D.'s in at least three fields, or . . . that may be expected to increase the number of Ph.D.'s awarded within a few years."

2.0 Comprehensive universities and colleges: Institutions that "lacked a doctoral program or had an extremely limited doctoral program" but "offered a Liberal Arts program and at least one professional or occupational program" and had enrollments over 1,500 if private, and over 1,000 if public.

3.0 Liberal Arts colleges: Institutions that have "predominantly" a Liberal Arts "tradition" and that do not meet the criteria for membership in the previous two categories.

This range of Carnegie classification categories includes all United States four-year colleges and universities, exclusive of professional schools and other specialized institutions. The Project on Reallocation also carried out comparative analyses of subsets of institutions within these categories (e.g., selective Liberal Arts colleges, research universities) but the results of these analyses are not reported here.

Enrollment growth is the dominant enrollment experience of four-year colleges and universities over the ten-year period 1972-1981. Almost one-third of respondent institutions have implemented enrollment

caps. Enrollment growth is associated with greater use of alternatives to tenure-track staffing; enrollment decline is associated with greater use of retrenchments to reduce existing staff.

About 69 percent of respondent institutions had enrollment increases of five percent or more (enrollment "gainers"), compared with only 20 percent of institutions that experienced enrollment decreases of five percent or more (enrollment "decliners"). About 11 percent of our respondents had enrollment decreases or increases of less than five percent during the ten-year period ("stable-enrollment" institutions). As suggested by Table 1, a significantly larger percentage of doctorate-granting institutions were enrollment gainers (81 percent), and a significantly larger percentage of Liberal Arts colleges (28 percent) experienced enrollment decline.

TABLE 1

FTE ENROLLMENT CHANGE, FALL 1972 TO FALL 1981*,
BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION

Carnegie Classification	Growth N	Growth %	Stable N	Stable %	Decline N	Decline %
Doctorate-granting	34	81	3	07	5	12
Comprehensives	101	74	15	11	21	15
Liberal Arts Colleges	80	60	16	12	37	28
TOTALS**	215	69	34	11	63	20

* Change is defined as at least 5% growth or decline in FTE enrollment.
** Six of our 318 institutions did not exist in 1972.

One of the principal responses institutions are making to deal with enrollment surges in areas like business, engineering, and computer

science is to cap enrollments--almost a third of all our respondent institutions have either institution-wide or program-specific enrollment caps. The use of enrollment caps appears to be concentrated in certain types of institutions. Almost two-thirds of the doctorate-granting institutions have enrollment caps, whereas over 80 percent of Liberal Arts colleges do not. Doctorate-granting universities are significantly more likely to have used this management device to control or limit imbalances due to student demand. Caps on specific programs account for 70 percent of reported enrollment caps.

To a statistically significant degree, enrollment gainers were likely to make greater use of part-time faculty than decliners or stable-enrollment institutions. About 34 percent of gainers had appointed more than 10 percent of their full-time faculty to non-tenure tracks, compared with 20 percent of decliners and 17 percent of stable-enrollment institutions. Conversely, enrollment decliners were more likely to have retrenched faculty than gainers or stable-enrollment institutions. About 28 percent of decliners had retrenched faculty since 1977, compared with about 13 percent of gainers and about 14 percent of stable-enrollment institutions.

Tenure-Related Staffing Practices

Traditional tenure-track staffing remains the predominant method of appointing faculty members among four-year colleges and universities. Institutions most likely to have no tenure system are small, private, Liberal Arts colleges.

Traditional tenure remains firmly in place. Ninety-four percent (n = 299) of respondent institutions in the Project survey had tenure systems. Only six percent (n = 19) had no tenure system but appointed all faculty to fixed-term contracts or on some form of open-ended agreement. Institutions using no tenure system were, to a statistically significant degree, likely to be small, private, Liberal Arts colleges. Small size, private control, and Liberal Arts classification are highly interrelated institutional characteristics in our sample and in the four-year population.

About 57 percent of full-time faculty members are tenured at four-year colleges and universities; however, when the percentage of full-time-equivalent (FTE) faculty members who are tenured is considered, the tenure ratio falls to about 50 percent. Large, public, systematized, and doctorate-granting institutions, and institutions with experiences of stable or declining enrollments, are likely to have higher tenure proportions; small, private, non-systematized, and Liberal Arts colleges, and enrollment gainers, are likely to have lower tenure proportions.

In 1973 the Keast Commission reported that "it will probably be dangerous for most institutions if tenured faculty constitute more than one-half to two-thirds of the total full-time faculty during the decade ahead" (Commission on Academic Tenure, 1973, p. 50). Discussions of tenure proportion in the literature have tended to focus attention on specific institutions, and on the upper end of this range. Collectively, such reports give the impression that tenure levels are generally too high. Our results refute this for the four-year college and university segment of American higher education.

Table 2 shows that about 57 percent of full-time faculty at all respondent institutions were tenured in Fall 1981. However, measuring institutional tenure levels as the percentage of full-time faculty that is tenured ignores the additional non-tenured faculty resources and staffing flexibility many institutions have gained by using part-time appointments, which represent about 25 percent of total faculty members in Fall 1981. Calculating institutional tenure level as the percentage of full-time-equivalent (FTE) faculty that is tenured (with one part-time faculty member counted as one-third FTE) shows that, for the 299 respondent institutions that had tenure systems, the mean FTE tenure ratio is .503.

Among the 299 institutions with tenure systems, FTE tenured faculty proportions (shown parenthetically in the following discussion) were likely to be lower at small (.467), private (.468), non-systematized (.476), and Liberal Arts colleges (.470)--institutional characteristics that are highly interrelated, as stated above. Enrollment gainers (.480) also were likely to have lower FTE tenure proportions than decliners (.546) or stable-enrollment (.554) institutions. Large (.557), public (.557), systematized (.556), and doctorate-granting (.547) institutions, and stable-enrollment institutions (.554) and enrollment decliners (.546), were likely to have higher FTE tenure proportions.

Almost 30 percent of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems have established tenure quotas or absolute limits on the number or percentage of faculty who may hold tenure at the institution at any one time; about one-third of these quotas were at the department or unit level.

TABLE 2

PROJECT ON REALLOCATION
FACULTY (HEADCOUNT)--FALL 1981

		Response from Sample Institutions				
		Full-Time		Part-Time		Total
		N	%	N	%	
Tenured	N	49,012	98.8	588	1.2	49,600
	%	57.42		2.0		43.5
Tenure-Track	N	25,509	98.5	389	1.5	25,898
	%	29.88		1.3		22.7
Other*	N	10,843	28.1	27,750	71.9	3,859
	%	12.7		96.6		33.8
TOTALS		85,364	74.8	28,727	25.2	114,091
		100.000		100.000		100.000

	National Estimate (X 4.3)**		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
Tenured	210,752	2,528	213,280
Tenure-Track	109,689	1,673	111,362
Other*	46,625	119,325	165,950
TOTALS	367,066	123,526	490,592

*"Other" includes both faculty on appointments at institutions that do not award tenure and faculty on non-tenure-track appointments at tenure-awarding institutions.

**Responses from sample institutions (which represent slightly more than 23 percent of the total number of four-year colleges and universities in the U.S.) times a factor of 4.3.

Eighty-eight of the 299 respondent institutions with tenure systems (29.4%) reported having established tenure quotas at the institutional level; however, only 31 of the 299 (10.4%) had established quotas for particular academic units. Of the 88 with tenure limits at the institutional level, 37 (42%) had absolute percentage limits and 51 (58%) characterized their limits as informal guidelines. Chait and Ford (1982) have estimated that there are approximately 300 institutions with some form of tenure quotas or guidelines. On the basis of the data in this study, the figure for the four-year college and university population would appear to be about 380 institutions.

This is a surprisingly large number because the imposition of tenure quotas does not appear to relate significantly to any of the institutional characteristics found to be associated with higher tenure proportions. Specifically, there is no statistically significant relationship between establishment of tenure quotas and Carnegie classification, type of control, institutional size, system status, or enrollment experience.

The difficulty of attaining tenure is perceived to have increased at two-thirds of all types of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems; ninety-six percent of responding institutions attribute this increased difficulty to deliberate efforts to limit tenure awards, primarily through tougher tenure standards. Respondents reported similar perceptions of promotion attainment difficulty.

Of 297 institutions with tenure systems responding, 203 (68.4%) reported that tenure had become more difficult to attain at their institutions over the five-year period 1977-1982. About 29 percent

(n = 87) reported that tenure attainment difficulty was about the same, and 2 percent (n = 6) said tenure had become easier to attain.

Of the 203 that reported tighter tenure requirements, 190 responded to a question of how this had come about. Of the 190 institutions responding (which represented about 64 percent of institutions with tenure systems in the sample), 183 (96.3%) cited specific efforts to limit tenure awards. One hundred fifty-seven (83%) indicated that existing tenure criteria had been more strictly applied or that new, more restrictive criteria had been adopted; six institutions (3.2%) cited institutional use of tenure quotas; and 20 institutions (10.5%) cited a combination of these factors. Only seven institutions (3.7%) cited "other factors."

Institutions were also asked the underlying reasons for tighter tenure, and 147 responded. One-third (n = 49) indicated that tenure attainment difficulty had increased as a result of efforts to improve academic quality. Another third (n = 49) cited economic factors--improving the fiscal position of the institution, achieving greater flexibility in program provision and allocation of personnel, or responding to changes in the academic marketplace. A final third (n = 49) indicated that a combination of the above factors or other factors--including, in the case of one respondent institution, curriculum change--accounted for increased difficulty in tenure attainment at their institutions.

The likelihood of institutions reporting greater difficulty in tenure attainment did not differ to a statistically significant degree with any of the institutional characteristics treated as independent variables in the analysis, although slightly higher percentages of

comprehensive, public, medium-sized, nonsystematized institutions, and enrollment decliners reported tighter tenure.

Institutional respondents' perceptions of change in the difficulty of attaining promotion follow the same general pattern. Promotion is generally perceived to have become, through deliberate efforts, more difficult to attain, with the least perception of increased difficulty among private, nonsystematized, and Liberal Arts institutions. Of 310 institutions responding (including 11 institutions with no tenure system), 195 (62.9%) reported that promotion had become more difficult to attain at their institutions over the five-year period prior to the Project on Reallocation survey.

About half of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems conduct periodic post-tenure reviews; about three percent report using results from these reviews for dismissal of tenured faculty.

Of 299 respondent institutions with tenure systems, 154 (51.1%) reported systematically reviewing all tenured faculty. Of 146 responding institutions, half reported annual review cycles, about 20 percent reported three-year review cycles, and about 20 percent reported five-year review cycles. Of 137 institutions responding, about 72 percent reported their reviews were conducted by a combination of peer faculty and administrators.

One hundred forty-seven institutions reported on how the results of post-tenure review were used. While 108 (73.5%) said the results were used to improve faculty performance, only 10 institutions (6.8% of those responding to the question, and 3.3% of total respondents with tenure systems) indicated that (negative) post-tenure reviews were used to terminate tenured faculty members.

It is possible, of course, that more institutions use the evidence of negative post-tenure review to terminate tenured faculty than are willing to say so; at the same time, these results agree well with reports in the literature on post-tenure review (e.g., Chait and Ford, 1982, pp. 176-181; Perry, 1983).

Alternatives to Tenure-Track Staffing

Use of part-time faculty is by far the most prevalent staffing alternative to traditional tenure-track staffing at four-year colleges and universities. Private institutions and enrollment gainers are likely to make greater use of part-timers.

Of 318 respondent institutions, 294 (92.5%) employed part-time faculty. Twenty-four institutions (7.5%) reported no part-time faculty. In the Fall of 1981, 28,727 part-timers were employed at the 294 institutions using part-time faculty. The proportion of total headcount faculty that were part-time in Fall 1981 was .252.

To a statistically significant degree, private institutions were likely to have higher proportions of part-time faculty than public institutions. The finding of significantly higher use of part-timers among private institutions is consistent with Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne's (1982) finding (based on National Science Foundation data for scientific fields only) that private institutions are more likely to employ part-timers (in scientific fields) than public institutions (p. 19). These researchers also found that the function of part-timers at almost all institutions is in classroom-related activities (p. 21).

Gainers were more likely to have higher proportions of part-timers than those with stable or declining enrollments. It is possible that this is part of a larger pattern which links enrollment growth to use of flexibility-promoting staffing practices at the hiring (as opposed to the terminating) end of the staffing practice spectrum. Here, we wish to conclude only that use of part-timers is legitimated by a longer history of use than most of the alternative-to-tenure staffing practices analyzed in this study and occurs in over 90 percent of the institutions.

Leslie et al. (1982) report that there were 82,000 part-timers in 1960 and 200,000 in 1977 (p. 23). Our national estimate for four-year colleges and universities for 1981-82 is 123,526 (Table 2). We cannot support all of the major findings of Leslie's comprehensive treatment of part-time faculty: "It is not at all uncommon for institutions to have no count of part-timers and no way to report on the level of part-time employment. Few institutions have considered part-time employment at the policy level. For the most part, we see a free-wheeling department-level allocation of available faculty slots" (p. 143). Our interviews support this lack of institutional awareness about unit practices relative to part-time faculty, but our institutions had little trouble reporting the number of part-time faculty they were using.

Slightly less than two-thirds of four-year colleges and universities with tenure systems appoint full-time non-tenure-track faculty; on the average, about one in twelve full-time faculty at these institutions was a non-tenure-track appointment. Use of non-tenure-track faculty is highest among types of institutions with the least use of part-time faculty--large, public, and doctorate-granting institutions.

Of 298 institutions with tenure tracks, 194 (65.1%) appoint some full-time faculty to non-tenure-tracks. These 194 institutions appointed a total 9,847 non-tenure-track, full-time faculty in Fall 1981. The range in institutional responses was from 1 to 770 non-tenure-track appointments, and the mean proportion of full-time head-count faculty that was non-tenure-track was .081, suggesting that on the whole about one in twelve full-time faculty members at tenure-awarding institutions appointing non-tenure-track full-time faculty was non-tenure-track.

To a statistically significant degree, large, public, and doctorate-granting institutions were likely to have higher non-tenure-track proportions than other institutional types, and institutions in multi-campus systems were likely to have higher non-tenure-track proportions. There was no significant relationship between use of non-tenure-track faculty and enrollment experience, although gainers had higher non-tenure-track proportions than decliners and stable-enrollment institutions.

In attempting to account for the higher use of non-tenure-track appointments by large, public, and doctorate-granting institutions, we turn to Leslie et al.'s (1982) characterization of the limited usefulness of part-timers to institutions whose activities include a large component of research activity because of the "marginal involvement" of part-timers. The use of non-tenure-track positions shares with part-time positions the benefit of reducing commitments of resources to tenured positions but differs in removing many of the problems associated with "marginal involvement" in extra-classroom activities, by making faculty appointments that are full-time.

Reallocation

Over 70 percent of four-year colleges and universities provided opportunities for faculty to retrain for new or revised assignments in 1981-82; less than one percent granted paid leave to retrain during that period. About 17 percent of four-year colleges and universities had faculty retraining for new or revised assignment in 1981-82; more than half of these were medium-sized, public, and comprehensive institutions. Unionized institutions are significantly more likely than non-unionized institutions to provide opportunities for faculty to retrain and are significantly more likely to have faculty retraining for new or revised assignments.

The national discussion of reallocation led us to expect that institutions would be involved in retraining faculty to help with burgeoning enrollments in certain areas. Of 318 institutions responding, 230 (72.3%) reported providing opportunities to retrain, but in 1981-82 only three institutions (less than one percent) granted paid leave to faculty to retrain for new or revised assignment. Fifty-four institutions (17.3%) reported at least one faculty member retraining for new or revised assignment in 1981-82. These 54 institutions reported a total 103 faculty retraining. The range was one to ten faculty retraining, and the mean number of faculty retraining for the 54 institutions was 1.9 retrainees.

To a statistically significant degree, whether an institution had faculty retraining was related to Carnegie classification, type of control, size, and region--many of which are interrelated institutional characteristics. Both comprehensive (22.3%) and doctorate-granting

(20.0%) institutions were significantly much more likely than Liberal Arts colleges (11.2%) to have faculty retraining. Medium-sized institutions (23.6%) were more likely than small (12.2%) and large (11.9%) institutions to have faculty retraining, and public institutions (24.6%) were more likely than private institutions (13.1%) to have faculty retraining.

Unionized institutions were significantly more likely to provide opportunities for faculty to retrain. About 91 percent of unionized institutions reported providing opportunities for faculty to retrain, compared to about 70 percent of nonunionized institutions. Unionized institutions also were more likely than nonunionized institutions to have faculty retraining. About 36 percent of unionized institutions had at least one faculty member retraining in 1981-82, compared to about 15 percent of nonunionized institutions.

Three-quarters of institutional respondents reported reallocating funds or positions within budgets.

One-third reported that funds from non-academic areas had been reallocated to academic areas of the institutional budget. Doctorate-granting institutions were significantly more likely than Liberal Arts colleges to have reallocated funds and positions, and to have reallocated funds from nonacademic to academic areas.

Reductions

About 16 percent of four-year colleges and universities have retrenched at least one faculty member between 1977 and 1982, and 10 percent of tenure-granting institutions had retrenched at least one tenured

faculty member in that time. Institutions with an enrollment experience of decline were more likely to retrench than enrollment gainers or stable-enrollment institutions. Unionized institutions were more likely to retrench faculty, and to retrench larger numbers of faculty, than nonunionized institutions. However, unionized institutions were no more likely than nonunionized institutions to declare financial exigency.

In order to assess the magnitude of faculty reductions at four-year colleges and universities, we asked institutions to tell us the number of faculty laid off, the number terminated, or the number who resigned when threatened with dismissal over the five-year period from 1977-1982. The total number of faculty involved is as follows:

-- 237 layoffs--98 (41%) of them had tenure

-- 683 terminations--188 (27%) of them had tenure

-- 397 faculty resigned when threatened with dismissal

Our national estimate reveals that from 1977 to 1982 approximately 3,956 faculty were laid off or terminated and another 1,707 resigned when threatened with dismissal. However, these figures on faculty reductions include dismissals for cause (incompetence, moral turpitude) and for medical reasons and, consequently, are not exclusively retrenchments. Retrenchment was defined by the Project as "dismissal (including layoff) of tenured faculty members, or dismissal (including layoff) of non-tenured faculty members in mid-contract, for reasons other than just cause or medical reasons."

Of 318 respondent institutions, 52 (16.4%) had retrenched at least one faculty member since 1977. The total number of faculty retrenched by the 52 institutions was 453; the number retrenched ranged from 1 to

37, with two retrenchees as the modal response, and a mean of 8.7 retrenchees per retrenching institution. Of 299 tenure-awarding institutions, 30 (10.0%) had retrenched at least one tenured faculty member since 1977. The total number of tenured faculty retrenched by these institutions was 192; the range was 1 to 35, with two tenured retrenchees as the modal response, and a mean of 6.4 tenured retrenchees per retrenching institution.

In a study by Sprenger and Schultz (1974), 52 of the 91 institutions reporting staff reductions gave enrollment decline as the primary reason for staff reductions. This is supported by our findings. Enrollment experience is related to a statistically significant degree to retrenchment. About 28 percent of enrollment decliners had retrenched at least one faculty member, compared to about 14 percent of institutions with stable enrollments and 13 percent of enrollment gainers.

Unionized institutions are significantly more likely to retrench faculty than nonunionized institutions. About 30 percent of unionized institutions in the sample reported having retrenched faculty since 1977, compared to about 15 percent of nonunionized institutions. This finding is in agreement with reports by Baldridge et al. (1981) and the College and University Personnel Association (1980), which suggest that unionized institutions are more likely to retrench faculty than nonunionized institutions.

Institutional use of retrenchment is attributed to financial exigency in less than half of the cases reported in this study; academic program closure, program reduction, and declining demand for programs account for about half of reported retrenchments. Small, nonsystematized

and Liberal Arts institutions are more likely to have declared financial exigency.

Twenty-six (8.2%) institutions reported having declared financial exigency from 1977 to 1982, including 24 of the 52 institutions that reported retrenching faculty since 1977. Seventeen of the 26 institutions are less selective Liberal Arts colleges, and seven are comprehensive institutions. Forty-eight of the 52 institutions that reported retrenching faculty also reported the reasons for these retrenchments. Only 7 of the 48 (about 15%) cited financial exigency, whereas 25 (about 52%) gave program closure, program reductions, and enrollment decline as specific reasons for retrenching faculty. These data suggest that retrenching faculty on grounds related to discontinuance of specific academic programs was more common between 1977 and 1982 than retrenchment due to declared financial exigency.

To a statistically significant degree, Liberal Arts colleges, small institutions, and nonsystematized institutions (highly interrelated characteristics) were more likely than other institutional types to have declared financial exigency since 1977.

One-half of four-year colleges and universities engage in no early retirement planning; about 37 percent offer incentives for faculty to retire early, and about 37 percent have had faculty elect early retirement during the 1981-82 year. Early retirement planning is less likely to occur at small, private, nonsystematized, and Liberal Arts institutions. Provision of incentives for early retirement and faculty electing early retirement are more likely to occur at large, public, and doctorate-granting institutions. Provision of incentives and faculty retiring early appear to be closely related.

Of 317 institutions responding, 157 (49.5%) reported no formal or informal early retirement planning for faculty at their institutions. Ninety-three institutions (29.3%) reported having a formal early retirement plan, and 67 (21.1%) reported negotiating early retirements with faculty individually, on an informal basis. Institutions with no formal or informal planning efforts were more likely to be small, private, nonsystematized, and Liberal Arts institutions. Institutions with formal early retirement plans were more likely to be large, public, systematized, and doctorate-granting institutions.

Of 299 institutions responding, 111 (37.1%) reported providing incentives for faculty to retire early. With regard to types of incentives, 17 (15.3%) of the 111 reported providing retirement income supplements, 14 (12.6%) continued employee benefits after retirement, 9 (8.1%) offered reduced teaching loads, 54 (48.6%) offered a combination of the above incentives, and 17 (15.3%) reported "other incentives." Large, public, systematized, and doctorate-granting institutions were more likely to provide incentives for faculty to retire early.

Of 305 institutions responding, 193 (63.3%) reported no faculty electing early retirement during 1981-82, and 112 (36.7%) reported at least one faculty member electing early retirement. These 112 institutions reported a total 462 faculty electing early retirement in 1981-82. The range of institutional response was from 1 to 32, the modal response was 1, and the mean number of early retirements for the 112 institutions was 4.1. On the basis of the figures reported by our respondents, we estimate the number of early retirements nationally in 1981-82 as 1,987. Institutions at which faculty had elected early retirement were more likely to be large, public, and doctorate-granting.

That the same types of institutions were both more likely to provide incentives and to have faculty elect early retirements (i.e., large, public, and doctorate-granting) tends to support the literature which suggests that provision of incentives is the key to increasing early retirements (e.g., Ladd and Lipset, 1977; Mitchell, 1981; Patton, 1976).

As a staffing practice, early retirement is a form of elective therapy performed on an institution with the end of freeing up resources invested in tenure commitments, rather than a form of catastrophic intervention aimed at curing a critical financial condition by radical surgery: The institutions suffering least from enrollment decline are those most likely to use the practice--large, public, and doctorate-granting institutions. At the same time, these types of institutions are likely to have higher tenure proportions than other categories of institutions and therefore may have more incentive to use the practice.

Although the Project did not collect survey data on the frequency of the practice, both our interviews and the literature support the conclusion that attrition is the most common way to control or reduce the number of faculty positions.

In their study of staff reduction policies in 163 institutions in 14 different states, Sprenger and Schultz (1974) report that not filling vacancies was the most common method of reducing staff (pp. 22-23). Dougherty (1980a, 1980b, 1980c) reports that the University of California--Riverside "absorbed" 42 positions and the University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire "absorbed" 30, through attrition.

The crucial debate over controlling faculty positions through attrition centers on deciding who has the ultimate authority to collapse

or to fill or create a position. We asked our respondents, "In the case of a faculty vacancy, whose approval must be gained before the position can be refilled?" Almost 85 percent replied that the campus administration's approval was necessary. The fundamental point here is that the decision to fill or create a position is an essential ingredient in a system of fiscal management. In some institutions in our sample, nine out of ten times the decision to create a tenure-track position is a de facto commitment to tenure for the person hired.

At one of the campuses in our survey, the chief academic officer described in the following (paraphrased) statement how entry to the tenure track was controlled:

> We have approximately 1,060 tenure-track positions and another 1,000 non-tenure-track and part-time faculty. Each year, through resignations and retirement, we have to decide what to do with the vacancies. This discussion takes place with the full understanding that, if we fill 40 positions with tenure-track appointments, fully 36 or 37 of the appointees will be tenured at the end of the probationary appointment. In order to remain flexible in our staffing, therefore, we have to be very careful about entry to the tenure-track.

Not filling a position when the incumbent resigns, retires, or is dismissed not only brings about immediate savings, but is probably the least likely of the common ways of reducing the number of faculty positions to arouse significant opposition from faculty, because no continuing faculty member's job is directly sacrificed. However, as Mortimer and Tierney (1979), Strohm (1981), and others have pointed out, collapsing positions by attrition may prevent the infusion of new ideas from newly hired faculty and the opportunity to realize affirmative action goals. In the following section, we explore the use of attrition as a reallocation and reduction strategy.

PART II

REALLOCATION AND REDUCTION STRATEGIES: WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW THEY WORK

Our review of the literature and site visits have resulted in a typology of reduction and reallocation strategies. In the following section, we have identified these strategies and make a number of observations about their effectiveness. In some cases, these observations lend themselves to recommendations for effective practice, whereas in other cases they simply express dilemmas about their effective use.

The Strategies

For heuristic purposes, we can identify two approaches to reduction and reallocation and two ways to implement these approaches. As a practical matter, this involves a two-by-two matrix (Figure 1).

Type of Implementation	Management Strategy	
	Attrition	Decrements (Increments)
Across the Board	Laissez-faire Management	Traditional Planning
Selective	Starve Problems/ Feed Opportunities	Strategic Planning

Figure 1. Institutional Approaches to Reallocation.

Attrition is probably the more common reallocation approach. In this situation, institutions merely capture loose positions and funds as they become available. This is essentially a reactive strategy. On the other hand, some institutions plan decrements in order to handle decline. This is more aggressive institutional strategy and involves the preparation of plans and contingencies to handle decline over a three- to five-year period.

The two approaches to reallocation, attrition and/or decrements, can be implemented in either across-the-board or selective fashions. We have then four specific management strategies, as follows:

Across-the-board attrition is reflected when expenditures are reduced by not replacing personnel who resign or retire, deferring building maintenance, or failing to replenish depleted stores of supplies. In these situations, the institution may administer hiring and spending freezes indiscriminately to all academic units. According to Bowen and Glenny (1981) and Dickmeyer (1983), across-the-board attrition is seen frequently in colleges and universities in the first few years of financial shortfalls and/or distress.

Across-the-board decrements occur when all budgets, or certain items in them, are cut by some percentage. In this situation, travel, maintenance, and equipment purchases are particular "targets of opportunity" for decremental funding. Across-the-board decrements are a common response to financial stress, as reported in a number of studies.

Selective attrition, which we characterize as "starving the problems and feeding the opportunities" (SPFO), allows slow budget reductions or reallocation of resources from marginal or low priority activities to areas of strength and high priority. Institutions that

exercise central control over vacant positions, for example, may decide not to replace a retiring history professor, while authorizing a business administration department to hire additional faculty.

Selective decrements, which are typified by the current interest in strategic planning, occur in at least three different ways:

-- the imposition of standard budget targets on each of the institution's units and the reallocation of these funds to high-priority programs,
-- the imposition of variable targets to create a reallocation fund (a fund for excellence?),
-- reallocations that arise from and follow priorities that have been identified through a comprehensive program review process.

Effectiveness of the Strategies

Our observations concerning the effectiveness of the four reduction and reallocation strategies cluster around three major headings. The first three points have to do with the content of budget cuts and their impact on institution politics. The next five points relate to the strengths and weaknesses of the various reductions and reallocation devices we have observed. Point nine is a comment on consultation processes in reallocation.

Content and Impact of Budget Cuts

1. Both academic and nonacademic areas feel the effects of resource allocation.

One large university reported that it had reallocated some $25 million over an eight-year period. Although $10 million of that had come from academic areas, $22 million of the $25 million went to pay energy-related bills. One-third of the chief academic officers responding to our survey reported that money had been allocated into academic affairs from other areas during the last three to five years. Forty-seven percent reported no change, and seventeen percent reported they had lost money to other areas within the institution.

2. Budget cuts and reallocation put great pressure on existing formulas and traditional systems of resource allocation.

An example of such pressure occurs in institutions using decremental strategies. It is very difficult to hand out budget cuts based on anticipated enrollment declines and/or budgetary shortfalls. Projecting enrollments for individual academic units tends to be an art rather than a science for most institutions. It becomes a "guessing game" to hand out internal budgetary cuts based on projected enrollment declines in academic units, unless enrollments are capped as a matter of strategic priority rather than as predictions of student demand.

3. It is difficult to persuade those in low priority areas that they should be low priorities.

Those who are losing funds and/or resources will seldom think it fair or wise. Most deans of education, for example, are committed to

helping the school of education and believe it is lack of wisdom that causes campus administrators to cut their budgets or collapse their positions, merely because enrollments are waning. On the other hand, since a major share of the reallocated money goes to pay "the hidden costs" of energy and fringe benefits, those who are identified as high priorities want to know where all the money went! It is hard to reallocate funds fast enough to handle the enrollment shifts that occur when students change their preference patterns. Built-in rigidities in the faculty personnel system, for example, work against rapid deployment of faculty resources into areas that experience marked gains in enrollment over a short (two to three years) period of time.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Reduction and Reallocation Strategies

4. Decremental budgets and planning systems help focus attention on priorities, but are very difficult to implement over time.

In one university, each academic unit was put on a five-year decremental target, with the average target being seven percent, but the range being from zero to approximately fifteen percent. Planning documents had to be filed to show how each of approximately twelve academic and ten administrative units intended to meet its five-year target.

There were some very good things that emerged from these targets:

-- The university community learned to believe that budget shortfalls were a reality.

-- Some academic offices began to think of how to raise money instead of just how to spend it!

-- Debate arising from the decremental targets identified at least fourteen major policy dilemmas for university-wide as opposed to college-level decisions (e.g., enrollment management, academic and administrative computing resources, and funding for libraries).

-- Over time, some academic offices began to implement vertical as well as horizontal cuts.

In order to be effective over time, however, such systems need to be able to accommodate contingencies, such as situations in which the assumptions and projections on which the targets were based have changed. In one case, a college did not actually experience the enrollment declines that were expected when the targets were handed out. In another case, abnormal faculty retirements, resignations, and tenure denials resulted in greater flexibility in the unit than had been anticipated when the targets were specified.

5. Leadership of the highest order is required to establish the point that setting priorities among academic units is the responsibility of the next highest level of decision-making.

One of the major internal debates about reallocation is the relative authority of various levels in the decision-making structure. Private institutions that operate on fiscal philosophies of "every tub on its own bottom" have to resolve the dilemma of how much of the total institutional revenue belongs to the institution as opposed to the sub-unit which generates it. One private university has decided that it would use most of its income from annual giving to "subsidize" the Liberal Arts college. The professional schools are supposed to be on a

"break-even basis." Public institutions that get state funds on a formal basis find it difficult to reallocate internal funds on some method other than the formula.

6. An effective "starve the problems and feed the opportunities" strategy requires a reasonably consistent definition of the problems and opportunities.

Most of our site visits identify less than three percent of the budget available for reallocation in any one year. Therefore, it takes three to five years before there are significant impacts from the SPFO strategy. Administrators have to be careful that the effect of reallocation and/or reduction is in a consistent direction. The effectiveness of selective attrition is compromised when there are significant changes in leadership of the institution, and/or the academic units involved, since this often requires the re-examination of priorities. In cases where priorities vary substantially from year to year, the net effect of SPFO over five years may be zero!

7. The key to success in most systems of strategic choice is realistic expectations.

Since reallocation devices operate largely on the margins of resource allocation, there is a danger that those who want to implement such systems would overpromise the results that are likely to occur. As long as institutions continue the overwhelming, historical pattern of allocating resources based on gradual incremental or decremental patterns, one can reasonably be skeptical of devices which promise to remake such historical truths. On the other hand, those institutions

which have encountered severe external crises such as financial exigency, budgetary shortfalls derived from declining state appropriations, or significant economic downturns in the environment, have been able to accomplish a significant amount of reallocation through SPFO and strategic planning.

8. Administrative reorganizations and program closures do not save significant dollars in the short run, unless positions are eliminated.

Since most of the costs of programs are in the people used to staff them, costs savings without position elimination are unlikely. On the other hand, effective management of program closures and reorganizations may save funds over the long run through attrition or through cost-avoidance techniques. Institutions may choose to close programs rather than to spend the funds that would be required to significantly upgrade them.

Consultation and Resource Reallocation

9. Faculty committees work best when they are not asked about individual programs or people, but about methods and criteria.

The ethic of the academic community requires that faculty be consulted about such important decisions as program reductions and closure, as well as reallocation plans. Many faculty refuse to participate in the identification of specific colleagues to be terminated, for example. In some cases, faculty are willing to participate in the identification of programs to be closed, but only after extensive debate about the method, process, and criteria to be used to arrive at such judgments.

There are several examples from our site visits to illustrate this point. In a small Liberal Arts college, the chief academic officer provided information and an analysis to a faculty committee. The committee eventually supported his judgment that closures and/or terminations were necessary, but they refused to identify the specific individuals of programs to be terminated. Yet, the legitimacy and trust gained through this extensive consultation was a crucial ingredient in maintaining stability on campus during the terminations. In another case, a standing committee of the faculty senate, the layoff committee, was successful in persuading the administration that layoffs were not necessary if certain other reallocation policies and practices were adopted. This faculty committee was very active in persuading colleagues in departments around the university to keep their teaching loads and student/faculty ratios more in line with the university-wide criteria. In still another case, a university created a budget panel consisting of administrators and faculty. The panel advises the administration annually concerning resource allocation decisions. This normal budgetary allocation device is a significant factor in identifying programs and units that can be targets of opportunity in times of decline, and the pattern of regular consultation is a significant factor in the identification of areas for potential budgetary cuts or reallocation.

REFERENCES

Bagshaw, M. "Faculty Staffing Practices at Four-Year Colleges and Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1984.

Baldridge, J. V., Kemerer, F. R., and associates. Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Bowen, F. M., and Glenny, L. A. "The California Study." In Higher Education Financing Policies: States/Institutions and Their Interactions, edited by L. Leslie and J. Hyatt. Tuscon, Arizona: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, 1981.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: Revised Edition. Berkeley, California, 1976.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. More than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Chait, R. P., and Ford, A. T. Beyond Traditional Tenure: A Guide to Sound Policies and Practices. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.

College and University Personnel Association. "Tenure and Retrenchment Practices in Higher Education: A Technical Report." Journal of the College and University Personnel, 31 (1980): 1-226.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (Keast Commission). Faculty Tenure: A Report and Recommendations. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Dickmeyer, N. Financial Conditions of Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1983.

Dougherty, E. A. "What is the Most Effective Way to Handle Program Discontinuances: Case Studies from 10 Campuses." Paper presented at the American Association of Higher Education Conference, Washington, D.C.: April 18, 1980a.

Dougherty, E. A. "University of California--Riverside." Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1980b.

Dougherty, E. A. "University of Wisconsin." Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, 1980c.

Johnson, M. D., and Mortimer, K. P. Faculty Bargaining and the Politics of Retrenchment in the Pennsylvania State Colleges, 1971-1976. University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, 1977.

Kanter, R. M. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." Perspectives on Leadership. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Ladd, E. C., Jr., and Lipset, S. M. "Many Professors Would Postpone Retirement if Laws Were Changed." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 16 (November 7, 1977).

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., and Gunne, M. G. Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education. New York, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

Mitchell, B. A. "Faculty Early Retirement: A Planning and Budgeting Issue in Higher Education." In Higher Education Planning and Budgeting: Ideas for the 80's, edited by Melodie Christal. Boulder, Colorado: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1981.

Mortimer, K. P. "Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Retrenchment." In Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources, edited by J. Mingle and Associates, pp. 153-170. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Mortimer, K. P., Bagshaw, M., and Masland, A. Flexibility in Academic Staffing. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, forthcoming.

Mortimer, K. P., and Ladd, E. C. "Faculty." In Higher Education: A Bibliographic Handbook, Volume II, edited by D. K. Halstead, pp. 177-235. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, 1981.

Mortimer, K. P., and Taylor, B. E. "Budgeting Strategies Under Conditions of Decline." In Responding to New Realities and Funding, edited by L. Leslie, pp. 67-86. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1984.

Mortimer, K. P., and Tierney, M. L. The Three R's of the Eighties: Reduction, Reallocation, and Retrenchment. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Patton, C. V. "Early Retirement in Academia: Making the Decision." The Gerontologist, 17(4) (August 1976): 347-354.

Perry, S. "Formal Reviews for Tenured Professors: Useful Spur or Orwellian Mistake?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, 27 (September 21, 1983): 25-26.

Shapiro, H. T. "Resource Planning and Flexibility." Business Officer (September 1978): 20-23.

Sprenger, J. M., and Schultz, R. E. "Staff Reduction Policies." College Management, 9 (1974): 22-23.

Stadtman, V. A. Academic Adaptations: Higher Education Prepares for the 1980s and 1990s. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Strohm, P. "Faculty Responsibilities and Rights During Retrenchment." In Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources, edited by James R. Mingle and associates, pp. 134-152. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.